

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-13 have been amended. Claims 2 and 14 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 3-13 still remain pending in this application.

**I. Rejection of Claims under Section 112**

Claims 4-8 were rejected as being indefinite for not having antecedent basis for "the mirror housing". Claim 1 has now been amended to clearly provided antecedent basis for this claim element.

Claim 10 was rejected for not having antecedent basis for "the fastening strap". Claim 10 has now been amended so that all claim elements therein have antecedent basis in independent claim 1 upon which claim 10 depends.

Claims 11-13 were rejected for not having antecedent basis for "the connector means". Claims 11-13 now depend properly from claim 3 which provides the proper antecedent basis for "the connector means".

**II. Rejection of Claims 1 and 2 under Section 102****A. Cossey**

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under Section 102 as being unpatentable over Cossey '572.

Cossey teaches a mirror assembly for viewing a child in a rear-facing child seat that is removably connected to a head rest. Cossey employs a clamp-type means for this interconnection. Due to the construction of this interconnection

configuration. It must be clamped on the top of the head rest. Thus, the mirror housing and mirror will be positioned above the top edge of the head rest. However, it is more desirable to position the mirror lower, namely, in a region that is typically near the gap that usually exists between the head rest and the seat back. However, as can be understood, attaching the mirror to a gap or to the metal support spanning therebetween is very difficult. Prior art devices, such as Cossey's, do not attempt to attach to this preferably gap region and, as a result, simple clamp onto the bulk of the head rest. This, as stated above, results in a higher positioning of the mirror.

The present invention includes a unique base plate that is specifically provided to span across the gap present between the head rest and the seat back. Fig. 14 provides a good illustration of this. Note that the positioning of the mirror and its ability to reflect images is much lower than the mirror positioned of Cossey. This is possible due to the unique base plate of the present invention.

The claims have been amended to more clearly set forth the unique aspects of the present invention. The limitations of claim 2 have now been incorporated into base claim 1. Accordingly, claim 2 has been canceled.

In view of the amendments to claim 1 and the arguments herein, Applicant submits that claim 1 is now allowable over Cossey.

**B. Nielsen et al. '384**

Claims 1-3 and 14 stand rejected under Section 102(e) as being unpatentable over Nielsen et al '572. Applicant assumes that the office action should have referred to Nielsen et al. '384.

The office action states that Nielsen teaches a mirror assembly that includes a base plate that is capable of being secured so that it spans the gap between the head rest and the seat back. Applicant submits that Nielsen is devoid of such a teaching which is required by the instant claims. Nielsen teaches the use of straps to secure a mirror housing directly to the front surface of a head rest. See Figs. 6, 7A and 7B, for example. In Nielsen, the mirror housing is configured to communicate directly with the head rest. For example, the housing of Fig. 7B is specifically contoured to communicate with the rounded face of the head rest.

Nielsen fails to teach a base plate that is secured to both the front surface of the head rest and the front surface of the seat back to enable with the mirror housing to be positioned low. As can be seen in Fig. 6, the mirror assembly 10 of Nielsen is higher than the mirror housing of the present invention. See Fig. 14, for example.

Thus, Nielsen does not meet the limitations of independent claim 1, as amended. Applicant submits that pending claims 1 and 3, as amended, are allowable over Nielsen.

**III. Rejection of Claims 1under Section 103(a)****A. Claims 4-9**

Claims 4-9 stand rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Nielsen et al. '384. Claims 2 and 14 have been canceled.

Claims 4-9 depend from now allowable claim 1. Therefore, applicant submits that dependent claims 4-9 are now also allowable over the cited prior art.

**B. Claims 10-12**

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Nielsen et al. '384 in view of Monahan.

Claims 10-12 depend indirectly from now allowable claim 1. Therefore, applicant submits that dependent claims 10-12 are now also allowable over the cited prior art.

**C. Claim 13**

Claim 13 stands rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Nielsen et al. '384 in view of Lumbra.

Claim 13 depends indirectly from now allowable claim 1. Therefore, applicant submits that dependent claim 13 is now also allowable over the cited prior art.

**IV. Conclusion**

Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 3-13, as amended, are allowable over the cited prior art. In view of the above, Applicants submit that pending Claims 1 and 3-13 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the Rejections and Objections are requested. Allowance of Claims 1 and 3-13 at an early date is solicited.

If an extension of time is required for timely submission of this response, Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time and the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account 02-0900 for the appropriate additional fees in connection with the filing of this response.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned should any questions arise.

Dated: Sept 26, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



David R. Josephs  
Registration No. 34,632  
BARLOW, JOSEPHS & HOLMES, LTD.  
101 Dyer Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Providence, RI 02903  
Tel: 401-273-4446  
Fax: 401-273-4447